Page 3 of 3

App. No.:10/707589

Filed: December 23, 2003

Conf. No.:1588

REMARKS

In reviewing the amendment previously submitted the inventor has called the undersigned's attention that the subject matter of claim 8 was not truly suggested by the combined teaching of Andrey in view of Hasebe et al. Although Hasebe et al does show a variation in magnet spacing, he uses conventional curved magnets and pole teeth and since Andrey predates him and is involved with the same problem it must be assumed that he did not believe the combination would provide a further improved result. Thus it is submitted that this combination is not in fact obvious.

Therefore favorable reconsideration is solicited.

Respectfully submitted.

Emest A. Beutler Reg. No. 19901

Phone (949) 721-1182

Pacific Time